COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 89.—No. 11.] LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 12th, 1835. [Price 1s.

TO THE

PEOPLE OF OLDHAM.

ON THE POLITICAL PROSPECTS OF GREAT BRITAIN AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE THIRD SESSION OF THE REFORMED HOUSE OF COMMONS.

LETTER I.

167, *Fleet Street*, 10*th Sept.* 1835.

FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN,—

I HAVE in this REGISTER collected together a greater mass of political intelligence, facts, and arguments raised and principles mooted, all bearing immediately upon the vital interests and fate of this country, than I think was ever assembled in the same compass. It was my design to make this collection, as the ground-work of a series of letters to you upon our present prospects; and I now offer the several articles and pieces of intelligence to you, and beg your attention to them, previous to my addressing you on the important theme I propose. The next REGISTER I intend shall contain three letters to you on this all-important subject, of which the present Number contains the interesting matter; and, in the mean time,

I am
Your obedient and
faithful Countryman,
WM. COBBETT, JUN.

KING'S SPEECH.

THE Parliament was prorogued this day (10th Sept.) by His Majesty in person, who delivered the following Speech:

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

1. "I find with great satisfaction, that the state of public business enables me to relieve you from further attendance, and from the pressure of those duties which you have performed with so much zeal and assiduity.

2. "I receive from all foreign Powers satisfactory assurances of their desire to maintain with me the most friendly understanding, and I look forward with confidence to the preservation of the general peace, which has been, and will be, the object of my constant solicitude.

3. "I lament that the civil contest in the Northern Provinces of Spain has not yet been brought to a termination; but, taking a deep interest in the welfare of the Spanish Monarchy, I shall continue to direct to that quarter my most anxious attention, in concert with the three Powers with whom I concluded the Treaty of quadruple alliance; and I have, in furtherance of the objects of that treaty, exercised the power vested in me by the Legislature, and have granted permission to my subjects to engage in the service of the Queen of Spain.

4. "I have concluded with Denmark, Sardinia, and Sweden, fresh Conventions, calculated to prevent the traffic in African slaves; I hope soon to receive the ratification of a similar treaty which has been signed with Spain.

5. "I am engaged in negociations with other powers in Europe and in South America for the same purpose, and I

trust that ere long the united efforts of all civilised nations will suppress and extinguish this traffic.

6. "I perceive, with entire approbation, that you have directed your attention to the regulation of Municipal Corporations in England and Wales, and I have cheerfully given my assent to the Bill which you have passed for that purpose. I cordially concur in this important measure, which is calculated to allay discontent, to promote peace and union, and to procure for those communities the advantages of responsible government.

7. "I greatly rejoice that the internal condition of Ireland has been such as to have permitted you to substitute for the necessary severity of a law, which has been suffered to expire, enactments of a milder character. No part of my duty is more grateful to my feelings than the mitigation of a penal statute in any case in which it can be effected consistently with the maintenance of order and tranquillity.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

8. "I thank you for the readiness with which you have voted the supplies.

9. "You have provided not only for the expenses of the year, and for the interest upon the large sum awarded to the owners of slaves in my colonial possessions, but also for several unexpected and peculiar claims upon the justice and liberality of the nation.

10. "It is most gratifying to observe that not only have these demands been met without additional taxation, but that you have made some further progress in reducing the burthens of my people.

11. "I am enabled to congratulate you, that the terms, upon which the loan for the compensation to the proprietors of slaves has been obtained, afford conclusive evidence of the flourishing state of public credit, and of that general confidence, which is the result of a determination to fulfil the national engagements and to maintain inviolable the public faith.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,

12. "I know that I may securely rely upon your loyalty and patriotism, and I feel confident that in returning to your respective counties, and in resuming those functions which you discharge with so much advantage to the community, you will recommend to all classes of your countrymen obedience to the law, attachment to the Constitution, and a spirit of temperate amendment, which, under Divine Providence, are the surest means of preserving the tranquillity and increasing the prosperity which this country enjoys."

Upon this Speech, the ministerial organ, the *Morning Chronicle*, of this morning, speaks before-hand in the following terms. The reader will perceive with how little scruple the Whig organ asserts that the "*country is thriving;*" and, the Speech concludes accordingly, the last words on the King's lips being, "tranquillity" and "prosperity" applied to the nation at large!

"The Speech from the Throne, to be delivered this day, can embrace few topics. Itlwould be invidious, perhaps, to recapituate the measures which have foundered in the House of Lords, and the important measures which have passed into laws may be dispatched in a few words. No doubt the Corporation Reform Bill—the great measure of the Session—will be placed in its true light before the country. On the state of affairs at home and abroad little can be said. *The country is in a thriving state;* and with respect to affairs abroad, there have been no new events since the commencement of the Session, except the Order in Council permitting the raising of the auxiliary force for Spain."

The *Standard* enters at length upon the losses to the nation sustained by the loss of Sir R. PEEL as minister; and goes patiently into the contrast between what he would have done, and what his opponents have done. If, however, the country be "prosperous," and be "tranquil," of what great moment is it to the nation which of the two sets of governors remain or have remained in power? If both sets advise the king to believe, that the country is ever prosperous, and if both sets sincerely believe it themselves; and, if the measures of both have an uniform tendency as far as effects the

prosperity of the country, what has the country to do, but to decline taking any part in the minor differences between the two, and to be content with humbly returning thanks to Providence for so disposing of events, that this singular nation is so eternally provided with governors who procure for it everlasting, uninterrupted prosperity! The apathy of the people, who can be roused by neither party, certainly arises from this feeling of pious content: that which we all desire, universal prosperity (at home) being always secured to us, the balance of account in meliorations of a more refined order, which has been made out by the *Standard*, is, with every possible expression of the deep gratitude for the more solid blessings we enjoy, left to those to whom such matters belong.—The following is the article of the *Standard*.

The session of 1835 closes upon this 10th day of September. It has been amongst the longest sessions upon record; of complete annual sessions it has been the most unfruitful of measures of any public importance; and with one or two exceptions, it has been the most disgraceful of the parliamentary years within memory. We have not yet time for a review of all the "special nothings" upon which the public time has been squandered since the 19th of February. It is enough to say that the Municipal Corporations Bill, which, through the firmness and moderation of the Lords, has been saved, by a measuring cast, is the sole public trophy of the year—the sole equivalent which the public has received for the loss of Sir Robert Peel's Church Reform Bill, his Tithe Commutation Bill, his Irish Tithe Bill, his measure for the Reform of the Irish Church, his Dissenters' Relief Bill, his Church Rates' Bill, and his measures for reform in the administration of the laws ecclesiastical, civil, and military; but, in truth, we do Sir R. Peel an injustice in describing the Municipal Corporations' Reform Bill as an equivalent; an equivalent occupies the place of something else. But as the public is well aware, Sir R. Peel was prepared to add to the measures recapitulated, a Municipal Corporations' Bill, doubtless to the full as good as that which yesterday received the royal assent. For the other measures which the public has lost by the removal of Sir R. Peel, therefore, there is no equivalent whatever; they are all a dead loss, as will appear when the account is fairly stated, *ex. gr.*:—

SIR R. PEEL'S MEASURES FOR 1835.*

English Church Reform.
English Tithe Commutation.
Irish Tithe Commutation.
Irish Church Reform.
Dissenters' Relief Bill.
Ecclesiastical Law Reform.
Civil Law Reform.
Military Law Reform.
Church Rates' Bill.
Municipal Corporations' Reform.

LORD MELBOURNE'S PERFORMANCES IN 1835.

Municipal Corporations' Reform.

We challenge cavil against the fairness of this account. Every measure recited in the first column, would have been long before this the law of the land had Sir R. Peel remained in office; unless, indeed, what is not improbable, the Whig-Radical alliance had offered a dilatory and factious resistance. That the single measure in the second column properly stands there by itself, is notorious to all. This is the result to the public of the ministerial change of last spring; and, surely, if there was any truth in the clamour raised this time twelvemonth as to the necessity of reforms in all departments, it is a result to produce disappointment and indignation.

It will, doubtless, be said that the opposition of the House of Lords defeated the design of the Melbourne Cabinet to bring forward measures correspondent to those undertaken by Sir Robert Peel. Such a pretence will not, however, bear a moment's examination. Lord Melbourne's Cabinet could not be defeated, or even resisted, in bringing forward measures which, in fact, it never brought forward at all—and, of its only two measures correspond-

* This and the following statement is, in the original, separated into columns.

ing with any of those specified in Sir Robert Peel's column, the House of Lords approved. The House of Lords has passed the Municipal Corporations' Bill—the House of Lords has passed the Irish Tithe Commutation Bill; it is Lord Melbourne himself who has sunk that bill, by burthening it with the weight of a sacrilegious iniquity, which no assembly of honest men and Christians could support.

This is a subject for the serious consideration of the people. Is the progress of improvement to continue to be thus arrested? Is the power of the legislature to remain paralysed, merely to insure a perpetuity of the emoluments and patronage of office, to a party feeble by itself, and strong only in alliance with the enemies of order and of the constitution? There is no reason whatever to hope that the tactics of 1835 will not be repeated in 1836, with precisely the same result of barrenness. Indeed, there is every reason to conclude that such must be the case, if the people do not, raising their heads above the mist of party, take a clear and comprehensive view of their own affairs. A reasonable man would naturally ask himself why, when so much was to be done, as appears from Sir R. Peel's column was to be done—and why, when all parties were pledged to so many important measures—so little more than nothing has been effected? To one rightly appreciating the policy of faction, when faction is most base and corrupt, this question answers itself. Faction can gain nothing by improvements, however precious to the public, in promoting which all parties will agree; faction is, therefore, always on the look-out for something monstrous and impracticable. If we were seeking for it for a century, we could not find a more striking and instructive illustration of this truth, than is afforded by the course of ministers in the last session. They had before them that long schedule of valuable improvements which Sir R. Peel had marked out, and which our readers have seen. Postponing this whole schedule except two items, they selected, as these two, measures with which, in form, it was improper to engage when they did, which was the least urgent of all the measures presented to them; and which they so incumbered, as to render the passing of one impossible, and the passing of the other difficult. We say that, in form, the Irish Church Bill, and the Municipal Corporations' Bill, were improper to be proposed in the form in which they were proposed when they were introduced by Lord Melbourne's government. They were precisely the two measures, and the only two measures, with respect to which ministers had declared it was necessary to wait for information, which information had not been received when the bills were proposed.

This infelicity is not merely curious; it furnishes the strongest proof that some overruling influence compelled the Cabinet to take up these measures in preference to others that did not demand a single day's delay; and yet, we say again, as far as public interest were concerned, these measures were the least urgent of all open to Lord Melbourne's government. Nobody will venture to say that an appropriation of ecclesiastical property to take effect half a century hence, bears any comparison, as to urgency, with a measure for the immediate reform of the Church—for the immediate adjustment of that perennial source of litigation and discord—the unsettled tithe question—with measures for the reform of the several departments of law, and for the immediate removal of whatever can offend the conscientious scruples of more than a million of our fellow-subjects. As little can it be pretended that matters of municipal regulation, which though general in their provisions, are unavoidably, in effect, but local acts—as little can it be pretended that mere municipal regulations bear any comparison as to urgency, with the several general measures to which we have been alluding. We say, in the third place, that of the two measures so unhappily selected for prosecution, the one, the Irish Church Bill, was so encumbered as to render it impossible that it should pass; the other, the Municipal Corporations' Bill, so burthened with vices as to render its passing exceeding difficult. The proof of the impossibility, in the one case, and

the details of the difficulty, in the other, are too fresh in memory to require that we repeat them—they constitute the history of the session.

Now, this perverse selection of measures by Lord Melbourne's administration, and the still more perverse deforming of the measures selected, cannot have been the result of accident. It may seem strange to the careless observer, notwithstanding the proverbial faculty of the Whigs to "build walls against which to knock their heads,"—it may seem strange that Lord Melbourne's Cabinet should thus have gone out of the way to court defeat and difficulty. The solution of the seeming paradox, as well as the reason of that apparent folly of his party, reproached against them by Mr. Sheridan, as habitual, lies in a truth never so strikingly manifest as at present —*the Whigs have no independent power as a party.* Greedy of office, and its gains, they have been ever willing to hire themselves to any faction, no matter how vile or dangerous, for that price. The walls against which they knock their heads are not of their own building; but hostile works raised against the institutions of the country by their masters.

N.B. The concluding part of this article applies more strictly to the House of Commons, and is here left out.

MUNICIPAL REFORM BILL.

THE following are the principal reasons given by the House of Lords for insisting on the amendments which they have retained in the Bill:—

"1st (referring to the appointment of justices of the peace).—Because, by the principles of the constitution, the appointment of justices of the peace ought to rest in the Crown, unfettered by any restraint: and where charters or corporations granted by the Crown are superseded by Parliament, it appears desirable to revert to the principles by which the appointment of justices should be governed, and to avoid the evils which have resulted from a contrary practice.

"2nd (referring to the division of boroughs into wards).—The Lords have insisted on certain amendments made by them, and have made amendments upon certain amendments made by the Commons in the schedules showing the number of wards, aldermen, and councillors assigned to each borough.

"Because the two Houses having agreed that in assigning the number of councillors to each ward, regard shall be had as well to the number of persons rated to the relief of the poor in such ward, as to the aggregate amount of the sum at which the said persons shall be so rated, it appears expedient to increase the number of boroughs which are to be divided into wards with the view of extending the benefit of the principle so established, which can only be applied in boroughs so divided.

"Because by far the larger portion of the rate levied in every borough being paid by a minority in number of the rate-payers, it appears expedient, by means of such division into wards, to afford a facility to such minority of obtaining some representatives in the council by which they are to be taxed.

"Because it appears equally expedient to afford a similar facility of obtaining some representatives in the councils to the different interests, which are almost always found even in boroughs of no inconsiderable population.

"Because the reasons above stated support a more extensive division of the boroughs, now divided in the schedules as amended by the Commons, as well as a division of certain of those not now divided.

"In endeavouring to secure to the several boroughs of which the division is extended by these amendments, the benefits arising from a fair representation of property and of different interests, the Lords have not been unmindful, that by creating four wards in every borough, not divided into that number of wards in the schedules as amended by the Commons, they should have practically raised in such boroughs the qualification in such boroughs; the Lords have, therefore, abstained from making any addition to the number of wards, where such

addition would have produced such effect, being unwilling by the more extensive division of a few boroughs to render more restrictive in such boroughs the qualification as amended by the Commons.

"The Lords further observe, that no inconvenience can arise from carrying into effect a division into wards as extensive as that made by their amendments, inasmuch as in each ward of even the smallest boroughs so to be divided, the number of voters will be such as would, without any such division, have rendered expedient a separate polling-place.

"3rd. (With respect to the borough of Alnwick).

The Lords insist on the amendment made by them to schedule A. by which the borough of Alnwick is struck out of the Bill.

"Because, although Alnwick may be a borough of prescription, yet the corporate body in that town exists for purposes entirely distinct from municipal government, having no jurisdiction of any sort, nor any power to impose any rate, or to exercise any interference with the general concerns of the place; and because, if hereafter, in consequence of increase of population, or any other circumstance, it shall appear to the inhabitants that a corporation for municipal purposes is desirable with a view to a good local government, this object may most properly be obtained by petition to his Majesty for a charter, under the 137th section of the Act, which provision appears expressly calculated to meet such a case, and upon the consideration of which petition all the circumstances may most fitly be investigated and ascertained.

"The above reason applies also to Llanelly and Yeovil.

"Conclusion:—

"The Lords participate in the anxiety manifested by the Commons to maintain a good correspondence and understanding between the two Houses, of the paramount importance of which to the public welfare the Lords are deeply sensible.

"The Lords have, in a spirit similar to that which actuated the Commons, abstained, in compliance with their wishes, from insisting upon many enactments which appeared conducive to the salutary working of the great measure under their consideration, and they entertain an earnest hope that the Bill as now amended by the co-operation of both Houses may produce contentment, and establish for the future upon a solid basis the good and quiet government of towns."

A "DESTRUCTIVE" HOUSE OF LORDS.

(*From the Morning Chronicle.*)

The following are some of the principal measures, which, after having received the sanction of the House of Commons during the present session, have been destroyed by the House of Lords.

"1. The Municipal Reform Bill—Certainly half, though not, we trust, wholly lost.

"2. The Bill for the payment of Tithes, and for the Reform of the Corruptions of the Church of Ireland.

"3. Imprisonment for Debt—For facilitating the recovery of debts, the relief of debtors willing to make cession of their property for the payment of their debts, the prevention of frauds by debtors, and abolishing imprisonment for debt except in cases of fraud.

"4. Municipal Corporations (Ireland)—To provide for the regulation of municipal corporations and borough towns in Ireland.

"5. Prisoners' Counsel—For enabling prisoners to make their defence by counsel or attorney.

"6. Roman Catholic Marriages—To repeal so much of an Act of the 19th year of George the Second, as makes void all marriages celebrated by any Popish priest between Protestant and Papist.

"7. Reform of Parliament (Scotland)—To explain and amend an Act passed in the second and third years of the reign of King William the Fourth, for amend-

ing the representation of the people in Scotland, and to diminish the expenses thereof.

"8. Stafford Disfranchisement—To exclude the borough of Stafford, in the county of Stafford, from sending burgesses to serve in Parliament.

"10. Constabulary Forces (Ireland)—To amend an Act of the third year of the reign of his late Majesty King George the Fourth for the appointment of constables in Ireland.

"11. Tithes on Turnips—For the amendment of the law as to the tithing of turnips in certain cases.

"12. Tithes Recovery—For the more easy recovery of tithes.

"13. Witnesses' Indemnity—To indemnify witnesses who may give evidence before Parliament in cases of bribery."

FOREIGN NEWS.

FRANCE.

(*From the Morning Chronicle, Sept.* 10.)

WE have received the Paris journals of Tuesday. The Chamber of Peers on that day commenced the discussion of the law concerning the press. As, however, it can be nothing more than *the ghost, the mere shade of a parliamentary debate*, in an assembly condemned beforehand to register, not amend, the measure, no interest was attached to the Peers' speeches or proceedings. We should except, however, the malicious curiosity of the Parisian public to observe with what degree of adroitness or impudence the French Ministerial Peers would unsay and contradict the opinions delivered by them when the law of the press was under consideration in the latter part of 1830. The *National* prints, by way of *memento*, the speeches of the Duke de Broglie, of the Duke de Barantes D'Argout, &c., &c., on that memorable occasion. M. de Broglie then made the vow from the tribune "never to appeal for the repression of material or moral disorder to any power or tribunal other than the national good sense represented by the jury." In the same speech the same noble Peer, in reply to those who urged that there ought to be a preventive censorship for engravings and lithographs, replied, that the pencil should be governed by the same laws as the press, "that a censorship of any kind was impossible, and that even were the idea tolerated, the Government could never find men who would consent to be censors."

The difficulty here alluded to is still felt, we learn; not any of the *quondam litterateurs* who voted and do uphold the law being willing to stand forth to public odium in the capacity of censors.

SPAIN.

(*From the Standard.*)

Paris, Sept. 7.

The *Sentinelle des Pyrenees* of Bayonne of the 3rd instant, says that letters from Barcelona say that the Carlist bands become every day more considerable, and that the Count d'Espagne, who is in communication with them, will put himself at their head. A species of National Assembly has been formed, to which deputies have been sent from Arragon, Valencia, Valladolid, and other parts in a state of insurrection. It is confidently stated that the assembly is drawing up the plan of a politico-liberal organisation. Many volunteers are being armed, and money seems not to be wanting.

The movement at Cadiz on the 25th is looked upon as an event of considerable importance. A junta has been formed, and an address sent to the Queen, to make known to her the wishes of the population, those wishes being the same as those of the inhabitants of Barcelona, Valencia, and Saragossa.

The following letter from Bayonne of the 3rd inst. I have just received:—

Bayonne, Sept. 3.

"The Carlist head-quarters, which were on the 20th ult. at Arronez, are now at Estella, from whence we have received news up to the 30th ult.

Persons from thence inform us of nothing new; it was only believed that the Carlists were getting ready to make several movements upon Puerto-la-Reyna. By fresh accounts of the affray of the 30th, at Ernani, the Christinos had 73 men killed and 123 wounded. The Carlists on their side had 11 killed and 81 wounded. The force of the Carlist troops which were engaged in this affair was composed of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th battalions of Guipuzcoa; there were also several men of the 5th detached from Irun, and the 6th battalion of Castille, which relieved the three above mentioned, after the first few hours of the engagement; and they behaved very bravely.

"Bilboa is again blockaded by the Carlists, who are in possession of the river, and over which they have thrown a bridge above the town: it is for this reason that a part of the forces of St. Sebastian and Santander have been ordered to advance in haste on Portugalette. The arrival of Yuergue produced a great sensation in the Carlist party at Catalonia. The Corregimiento de Lalar has been abandoned by the Christinos; 2500 Carlists are supposed to be in arms, and it is asserted that the Corregimiento de Lerida and that of Urgel will soon be in the possession of Don Carlos. The governor of the Corregimiento de Lalar, in retreating upon Lerida, received three bullets in his breast, and was afterwards despatched by his own army. At Barcelona, in execution of an order from the Junta of the town, they have refused to pay the bonds of the Treasury of Madrid. The inhabitants of Puycerda are removing their property into France. The *El Vapor* of the 30th ult. contains the declations of the Urbans of Madrid, which were not allowed to be published in the capital."

RUSSIA.

THE REVIEW AT KALISCH.

Kalisch, Aug. 22.

The Emperor, who arrived here on the 19th, reviewed on the 20th the Kurds, Cossacks, Don Cossacks, Georgians, and Circassians. These troops, about 1,600 cavalry, performed many evolutions and sham fights, which presented the most picturesque military spectacle that Europe has seen since the middle ages. Conceive the gay coloured costume of 800 Kurd horsemen, mingled with the richly dressed Cossacks and Georgians, and among them the shining silver helmets and coats of mail of fifty Circassian princes, with a constant firing of muskets and pistols, often drowned in cries of Allah and hurrah, and you will have a faint idea of the scene. The image of war was complete in the moments when the Kurds, in two parties of 400 each, attacked each other, and so seriously contended for the standard taken at Erzeroum, that twenty generals and aide-de-camps in vain endeavoured to separate them, and at length their Monarch himself, their Padishab, was obliged to ride amongst them, and to pacify and separate the combatants, who already had several wounded. These inhabitants of the frontiers of the empire now saw their Sovereign for the first time, who called out and commanded several chans and princes. The most indifferent spectator can never forget the enthusiasm that sparkled in their eyes when the Emperor, accompanied only by two aide-de-camps, put himself at their head, and led several attacks. Yesterday there was a grand parade of the whole corps of General Rudyer, and of the cavalry of the guard. The Emperor, in whose brilliant and numerous suite were the Duke of Nassau and Prince Frederick of the Netherlands, having rode along the five lines amidst the continued acclamations of the troops, gave orders to present arms, and then turning to the Prince, their victorious commander, embraced him in front of the army which loudy cheered him. The troops then defiled before the Emperor in the most beautiful order. His Majesty remained on the ground from eight till one o'clock. Amongst the distinguised persons present were General Baron Kreuz, Count Wilt, and the Emperor's physician, Baron Wylie. Prince

Frederick has left us this evening. His Majesty will stop above eight days.—*Hamburgh papers.*

WHIG MANIFESTO.

THE following semi-official document is an article in the *Morning Chronicle* of this day (9th Sept.) by way of answer to the semi-official manifesto of the three great northern powers, taken from the German papers and inserted in the *Register* last week. The Whigs have required some days to consider this northern manifesto, and the Radicals will see what a bed of thorns it has placed them on. The hordes of northern savages may deserve the violent and unreserved epithets of the Whig writer; but, those savages are, doubtless, *ready for war;* and, unless the Whigs be ready also, one would think that different language would have suited the circumstances full as well.

"In common with our contemporaries, we copied a few days ago from the *Frankfort Journal*, which is well-known to be devoted to the Russian Government, a long article upon the approaching interview of the Sovereigns at Kalisch and Tœplitz. That almost official document breathes the unadulterated spirit of the oracle of which it is the organ. Prolix, involved, and pompous, it is in the genuine style of an aristocratical composition.

"The object of the writer, as far as we can make it out, is to show that Europe is divided into two 'zones,' the one Liberal, the other Monarchical—and be it observed, in passing, that when the parties who have agreed upon this manifesto speak of Monarchy, they uniformly mean Despotism. The Liberal 'zone,' supposed to comprise England, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, Bavaria, Wurtemburg, Baden, Switzerland, Saxony, Holland, and the Free Towns, is represented to be the scene of private misery and public calamity. Over those devoted countries the demon of anarchy sweeps in wild career; laws are trampled under foot; valuable institutions are 'swallowed up in dreadful abysses;' men perish under the lash of foul oppression; the State interests are ruined, and civilisation has almost wholly disappeared! In the Monarchical 'zone,' embracing Russia, Prussia, Austria, Piedmont, the Papal States, and Naples, all is happiness and prosperity. In those fortunate regions, we are told, public order prevails, attended by personal security, inquiring philosophy, industrious literature, expanding science, increasing commerce, improving manufactures, and (*risum teneatis!*) 'legal liberty!'

"The Governments of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, we are told, have for twenty years, that is to say, since the settlement of Europe in 1815, sat aloof, passive spectators of what was going on around them; have permitted, with the forbearance of divinities, this separation of states into 'zones;' have allowed the two antagonist principles to work their way, the misguided nations to gather the lessons of experience, to accumulate facts, results, the admonitions of history, and the warnings of Providence. At length the fulness of time has arrived. The Quadruple Alliance, according to our new instructors, has sealed the doom of the Liberal principle. A cry of despair has burst forth from the wretched communities who dwell within the Liberal 'zone;' the Sovereigns of the North have heard the call, and, starting from the 'grim repose' in which they have so long been 'hushed,' are resolved, at this critical moment in the history of the world—to do what? Why *to confer together!*

"The writer in the *Frankfort Journal*, after thus winding up to the highest degree of excitement our curiosity to know what it is these Sovereigns mean to talk about when they do meet, dashes it down at a blow, by assuring us, with the utmost simplicity, that 'to know what they will say, we must listen at the door; or pay somebody to tell us, who, perhaps, may not tell us the truth.' In the next paragraph, however, he lets in a little light upon the subject, from which it seems that the Monarchs are

not above taking an example from the Liberal 'zone,' that they are about to imitate some of the proceedings of our Poor-law and Corporation Commissioners, by drawing up and issuing a set of queries, with a view to ascertain, after twenty years' experience, which is the best form of government,—the Liberal or the Monarchical? These queries are to be addressed 'not to the Royalists, not to the Liberals, not to the partisans of any system; but to all upright men of Europe and of the world who have seen this history of twenty years pass before their eyes.

"The subjects of the intended queries are then mentioned. They embrace, undoubtedly, many points of great interest, political, moral, commercial, and statistical. Each state is to be interrogated as to its progress in political knowledge, science, philosophy, commerce, manufactures, literature, arts, and education, in the following terms:—'Which nation is most satisfied with its form of government? Which has enjoyed the greatest degree of security, tranquillity, and liberty? Which has suffered the least from revolutions? Which is most attached to its Government, most devoted to its Sovereign?'

"We are not informed by the Russian scribe whether these 'queries' are to be circulated through the kingdom of Poland, the Polish provinces under the sway of the Czar, through the military colonies on the Don, among the tribes of the Caucasus, the people of Hungary and Transylvania, the inhabitants of Lombardy, of the Papal States, and Sicily. We suspect that if the interrogatories were to be sent to all those parts, the answers would be pregnant with the most instructive information, and would afford most important illustrations upon the subject of the *report* which the Sovereigns have commissioned themselves to draw up. The appendix of evidence would be particularly deserving of attention.

"We warrant it, however, that no evidence will be taken by these authorities but that of their own narrow-minded prejudices, and ignorant fears of coming revolutions; and then will come forth another long-winded manifesto, full of the same wretched nonsense which pervades this document. What!—do they and their venal journalists imagine it to be in their power to persuade the world that the human race have been in error since the beginning of time as to their most important secular interests?—that the hundreds of thousands who have died for liberty, have been victims to a false creed?—that the millions who have pined in slavery have sunk under imaginary sufferings and political tenets destitute of all foundation in truth? Can it be that nations, however civilised, are unable to understand their own interests, and to manage their own affairs; while Autocrats and their favourites are inspired by Heaven with a political sagacity which is withheld from the rest of their fellow-men?

"Who are the parties thus audaciously venturing to challenge a comparison between the free and despotic forms of government? Russia stands first on the list. What is this Russia? Nothing more or less than a great camp—a vast recruiting establishment. All her organisation is of a military character. There is no rank within the imperial dominions which is not connected with the army. Even the ladies about the Court take a precedence according to *brevet*. The Czar is supposed to have sixty millions of subjects, of whom at least fifty millions are slaves—slaves in every sense of the word—as much slaves as our West Indian negroes were, except only that they are ascribed to the soil, and cannot be sold separately from it. They are liable to be flogged at the caprice of their master, and incapable of acquiring, without his permission, any property of their own. In Russia there is no law but the will of the Emperor—no justice save that which is sold and bought for money. As to 'industrious literature' and 'expanding science,' we have heard indeed of ukases of banishment and confiscation printed in the Russian language. But we, at least, have yet to become acquainted with the names of those writers

who have embodied in that dialect the inspirations of genius and the fruits of learning.

"Nevertheless it is the Ruler of these Tartar hordes, who, fresh from the ignorance and barbarism of his unorganised, and almost unadministered dominions, is coming to Kalisch and Tœplitz and Prague, to sit in judgment upon the civilisation of Western Europe! Why does he not put his own house in order, before he meddles with the affairs of others? Let him set his fifty millions of slaves free. Let him educate his boorish subjects. Let him introduce the plough, and the sickle, and the loom into his wilderness. Let him establish throughout his empire equal laws, and impartial and incorruptible justice; and when he shall have thus learned himself, and taught to his subjects the *rudiments of political science*, let him then come westward, and study in the constitutions of the free states those further improvements for which his subjects will then be ripe.

"Who is the next member of this high Commission of Inquiry? Austria. Far be it from us to compare Austria with Russia as to progress in civilization. She is at least two centuries ahead of her eastern neighbour. But we may reasonably ask, is Austria entitled to declare that the success of her system of government proves the superiority of despotisms over constitutions? Are her people contented? Let the answer to this question be given by the Hungarians, the Transylvanians, the Venetians, the Milanese. Are they willingly obedient? May not their reply be inferred from a maintenance of a standing army of four hundred thousand men at a season when Austria runs no risk of foreign war—when in fact she has no *external* enemy. Are the resources of her empire fully developed? If they were, would she be obliged in time of profound peace to make an annual loan to supply the deficiency of her revenue? As to education and intellectual renown, where are we to look for her schools and universities? What are the names of her poets, her historians, her philosophers?

"For Prussia, the third member of this novel Commission of Constitutional Inquiry, we profess and feel unfeigned respect. Nay, we will pay her the compliment of saying, that we think her almost disqualified from sitting in council with her two colleagues on such an occasion. The Prussian Government has proved itself wise and enlightened. During the last twenty years it has been labouring unostentatiously, but diligently, to bring forward its subjects, and to prepare them individually and collectively for that representative form of government which the King stands solemnly pledged to grant to his people, whenever he shall have occasion to call upon them for any extraordinary pecuniary sacrifices.

"Prussia cannot make another war without establishing a representative government: because another war cannot be carried on without a loan, or an increase of taxation, and the Prussian Government has promised to have recourse to neither the one nor the other without the consent of the representatives of the people.

"Prussia swarms with elementary schools, and abounds with universities. There is scarcely a Prussian peasant who cannot read. In that kingdom intellect is instructed and exercised in every department of literature, science, and philosophy. Each of the provinces has its assembly of states to discuss local interests and advise the central Government. The transition from their present condition to that of a national representation would be easy and simple.

"Under these circumstances, therefore, we feel no sort of alarm at these approaching camps and councils. The threats implied in the Frankfort manifesto will, of necessity, turn out to be mere empty boastings. Does it mean that the three Sovereigns intend to curtail or abrogate the free institutions of the smaller States of Germany—of Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, Hesse, Saxony? The thing is impossible. *Germany* would never permit it.

"Does the manifesto mean that the triumvirate have resolved to send forth

an edict of proscription against the constitutions of Spain and Portugal, and to declare CARLOS and MIGUEL absolute monarchs of those realms? Such a proceeding would be ridiculous and childish and therefore utterly harmless. The Quadruple Alliance opposes an insuperable barrier to any such designs.

"That alliance is not merely an engagement between four Governments; it is a solemn league and covenant between four nations, determined to support each other to the utmost in defence of their liberties and independence, and resolved to make common cause against all who might dare, on such grounds, to attack them.

"That alliance is only the brief record which embodies a great and lasting principle; and though the treaty itself bears only the names of the four Powers who have bound themselves by its stipulations, yet many are the governments of Europe, and many are the milllions of men, who in their secret wishes, and in the fervent aspirations of their hearts, are associated with that great compact."

Upon this subject, in addition to this furious Manifesto, we find the following petulant reply to the *Morning Herald*, in the *Morning Chronicle* of Sept. 10th. We repeat, words are out of place, when the time for blows comes; and, to blows England must come, to remain an independent nation, and to war the Whigs must go, if they will retain power: aye, and to war the peaceful Tories must go too, if they will take the places of the Whigs!

"*The Herald* favoured its readers, yesterday and the day before, with disquisitions on our foreign policy, so far as the affairs of Turkey are concerned. In almost every sentence of those articles we find a blunder. 'It is painful,' says our Contemporary, 'to every Englishman who feels for the honour of his country, to contemplate the humiliation of the national flag in the waters of the East.' Has any British ship been captured in that quarter? Has the national flag been hauled down by any recreant commander? No such thing. The 'humiliation' is said to consist in this, that 'no British vessel of war is allowed to pass the Dardanelles, because Russia commands the Porte to close against us the gates of the Bosphorus.' The Barham, nevertheless, with Lord Durham on board, has either already entered, or will very speedily pass though, the Dardanelles, on its way to Therapia, and then also will navigate the greater part of the Bosphorus, almost to its junction with the Black Sea. Therefore it is not true that the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus are closed against us; and if Russia has given the Porte any orders to that effect, it is clear that they have been disobeyed; for Lord Durham's firman has actually been received by our Ambassador.

"'This is the practical result of the treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, more generally known by the designation of the "Secret Treaty," which Count Orloff negotiated with the Turkish Government behind the back of the feeble and drowsy Lord Ponsonby.' As the 'result' in question is the offspring of the writer's imagination, he may impute it to any cause he pleases. The fact that the treaty was a 'secret' one is sufficient to account for its not having been negotiated with the knowledge of Lord Ponsonby, of whom the writer and his correspondent must know little indeed when they presume to describe him by the epithets we have just quoted. It is well understood by those who are at all conversant with his Lordship's proceedings, that a more active, a more able, a more accomplished Minister, never represented this country in Turkey than the nobleman who has been thus unworthily assailed. If he were the feeble sinecurist whom the sage of *The Herald* has stigmatised, why was he permitted to remain in office by the Duke of Wellington? How happens it that all his acts were approved of by that individual—that his policy was adhered to, and that no notion of superseding him seemed to have been entertained at the Foreign-office during the *regime* of the Tories?

"'To the honour of Lord Palmerston

be it recorded, that for the first time has it happened under his administration of foreign affairs that a British vessel of war dare not disturb the supremacy of the Russian flag in the waters of the Bosphorus.' Suppose the case were, as it is here stated, that the Russian flag had the ascendancy in the Bosphorus, we rather believe that no instance of the kind ever occurred before, and that consequently the mode of treating it would be altogether a novel question. To say, therefore, that the abstinence from disturbing that supremacy has happened in his Lordship's administration for the first time, is what the French call a *betise,* evincing a total ignorance of history. But the truth is, that there does not happen to be any Russian ship of war at all in the Bosphorus at this moment; and therefore the flourish about the supremacy of the Russian flag in those 'waters' is one among the countless airy bubbles which *The Herald* often blows for the amusement of its juvenile readers.

"Our well-informed politician then quotes a passage from this journal, in which we stated the other day that it was not intended to demand a firman for the Barham to enter the Black Sea, and takes upon himself to assert that the Sultan dare not grant such a firman had it been solicited. We do not affect to be in the councils of the Grand Seignior, and cannot estimate the extent of concession to which he would or would not go in our favour. But we do know that this would be a boon which we have no right to ask. In the treaty of 1809, we solemnly bound ourselves to acknowledge the law of Turkey, which in time of peace excludes *all* foreign ships of war from the two Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus. It is true, that for the conveyance of our Ministers to Constantinople, and for other urgent purposes, we have occasionally obtained a dispensation of that law, as far as relates to the Dardanelles. But the true spirit and meaning of the article on that subject is this, that in time of peace no foreign ships of war shall pass from the Euxine to the Mediterranean, or *vice versâ.* The two Straits undoubtedly belong to the Porte, the territory on each side of them being wholly Turkish. The Porte, therefore, has the right, if she chooses to exercise it, of preventing her dominions from being endangered by the passage through them of armed ships of war. We recognised her law upon that point as of general application; and we so recognised it, in order that no partial exceptions to it should be admitted. In abstaining from asking a passage beyond Therapia, for the Barham, we still show our sacred regard for our compact; and therefore entitle ourselves, at any time, to call for explanations whenever any such exceptions are made in favour of other Powers. If the passage from the Mediterranean to the Euxine be shut against our ships of war, it must be shut also against Russia and France, and all other Powers. Does *The Herald* mean that we shall violate our treaties? Are we to go to war with Russia or with Turkey, or with both combined, because we choose to despise our engagements, without any other earthly purpose whatever to be gained? If we are to call upon the country to raise some twenty or thirty millions for hostilities against those nations, let us be able to say, at all events, that we have the "right" on our side, and that we are not going forth like the swaggerer of *The Herald* to contend for privileges to which we have no more title than we have to the throne of the Ottoman Empire.

"We leave it to France to settle the affair of the Mesange. We have already stated that the firman was granted by the Porte for that vessel to enter the Black Sea, for purposes altogether of a civil nature. Here would have been an exception to the law, against which we should not have complained, looking to the objects which M. Tercier had in view. It is true that the firman, though granted, has not been used, and that it is not improbable that this result is to be traced to the interference of the Russian Minister at Constantinople. But France is able, we presume, to take

care of her own interests and honour without our assistance."

AMERICA.

(From the Standard, Sept. 9.)

"The intelligence received this morning from the United States is of a distressing nature. A destructive fire in New York, mob tumults in Baltimore, and threats of civil war in the southern states, occupy the American newspapers. The Charleston papers of the 12th ult., received *via* Liverpool, inform us that at a meeting of the proprietors of slaves held in that city on the 11th, the following among other resolutions were voted by acclamation:—

"Resolved, 1—That we hold it to be an unquestionable truth that the subject of slavery, as it now exists in the slave-holding states of this union, is, in all its bearings, a domestic question, belonging exclusively to the citizens of these states; that the people of no other state have any right to interfere therewith in any manner whatsoever, and that such interference is utterly inconsistent with the federal compact, and cannot be submitted to.

"Resolved, 2—That we regard with the utmost indignation and abhorrence the proceedings of those incendiaries in some of our sister states who, under the name of 'Anti-Slavery Societies' and other specious appellations, are undermining our institutions, regardless of the fatal consequences which must inevitably result from the prosecution of their nefarious schemes, which, if successful, could not fail to involve the southern states in ruin, and produce the utter destruction of that class of persons for whose welfare they pretend to be so solicitous. The statements recently put forth of the existence at this time of 250 of such societies in 13 states, and the weekly issue from a single press, in the city of New York, of from 25 to 50,000 copies of those incendiary pamphlets and papers with which our public mail has been lately burthened, and which are now spreading their deleterious influence throughout the southern states, admonish us of the absolute necessity of taking prompt and decisive measures to avert the dire calamities which such proceedings are so well calculated to produce.

"Resolved, 3—That these proceedings have brought about a crisis, which makes an earnest, and we trust that it may prove an irresistible, appeal to all such of our fellow-citizens in the non-slave holding states as may disapprove of these societies and their measures, calling upon them by every consideration of duty and of patriotism, to manifest that disapprobation, not merely by the expression of their opinions, but by the most active, zealous, and persevering efforts to put down these associations, and to suppress that fanatical spirit which, in pursuing an imaginary good, is regardless of the fatal consequences which are inseparable even from its continued prosecution, *among which, not the least to be lamented, would be the certain destruction of the Union.*

"Resolved, 4—That under our political system, where a number of sovereign states are united together, by a written compact, in a federal union, for special purposes only—each member of such an union has an unquestionable right to expect and require (what is indeed the very basis of such a connexion), that no interference whatever shall take place with her domestic policy or peculiar institutions, either by the constituted authorities of the federal or other state governments, or by the people of other states, and it is the imperative duty of each state to prevent, by suitable penalties and provisions, their own citizens from being guilty of any such interference with the domestic policy of any other state.

"Resolved, 5—That the Post-office establishment cannot, consistently with the constitution of the United States, and the objects of such an institution, be converted into an instrument for the dissemination of incendiary publications, and that it is the duty of the federal government to provide that it shall not be so prostituted, which can easily be effeted by merely making it unlawful to transport by the public mail, through the

limits of any state, any seditious papers, forbidden by the laws of such state to be introduced and distributed therein, and by adopting the necessary regulations to effect the object.

"Resolved, 6—That for the purpose of making such an earnest appeal to the people of the non-slave holding states, as may convince them of the true state of the public feeling amongst us, it would in the opinion of this meeting be desirable to bring about a cordial co-operation among all the states having a common interest with us, either through a conviction, or in any other way best calculated to embody public sentiment, so that the truth may be made known, that however we may differ among ourselves on other points, we are on this subject united as one man in the fixed and unalterable determination to maintain our rights and defend our property against all attacks—be the consequences what they may.

"Resolved, 7—That the City Council be also requested to take proper measures to secure the strict performance of the duty imposed by the law upon the Harbour Master, of keeping a correct list of all persons arriving at and departing from this port; and that they also request the President and Directors of the Rail-road Company, to have correct lists of all persons arriving and departing by that conveyance, whether white, free-coloured, or slaves, and that measures be taken to have these lists regularly examined to the extent that incendiaries, and other evil-disposed persons coming among us, or attempting to pass through this state, may be detected and exposed."

"It affords an instructive lesson to the world, that, at a time when the old 'worn-out' governments of Europe have unanimously rejected the doctrine that one man has a right of property in another, the free and equal Republicans of America assert it in the most positive terms. Every one feels that there are practical difficulties in the way of slave emancipation in the Southern States of the American Union, and that it must be cautiously dealt with; but it is rather too much, and in other countries it would be considered as a stretch of despotism not to be borne, to insist that nobody shall be allowed even to moot the question.

"What can be more tyrannical than the proposition to prevent the transmission by the Post-office of papers, which are unpalatable to the ruling authorities of the state?—or the enforcing of the passport system, so thoroughly at variance with the laws and customs of that country from which the whole population of the American States revolted, on the plea that the mother country was not sufficiently free in her institutions, or her government of colonial dependencies? As for the threat of dissolving the union, *that* will sooner or later be put into execution. No one whose intellect does not grovel to the degradation of a crazy Benthamite ever looked for any other result of this ill-jointed and ill-governed confederacy. It has now lasted, in independence of England, about fifty years, but, under its present system, not much more than thirty; and none but a blockhead can imagine that it will hold together for another generation. Yet this is the immortal Republic, by the example of which, we are told, the long-tried institutions of England should be amended!"

(*From the Morning Chronicle, Sept.* 10.)

"We have received from the North and South American Coffee-house a file of New York papers to the 17th ultimo, being four days later than those from which extracts will be found in another part of our paper. The riots at Baltimore had produced considerable excitement in the usually quiet city of Washington, where crowds of a menacing character had assembled, their avowed object being the punishment of the persons who had distributed incendiary pamphlets on the abolition of slavery. The city authorities, on the first appearance of these alarming symptoms, called out a number of special constables, who, however, were unable to repress the outrages which broke out during the night of the 14th. Some wooden tenements,

occupied by the free negroes, were broken into and destroyed, and a house of ill-fame was set fire to and burnt to the ground. Several of the rioters were arrested, a great portion of whom are stated to have been mere boys. Slight riots, proceeding from the same cause, had also taken place at Lynn, and in different parts of the country."

Thus it appears, that the people of Baltimore, as well as the people of Charleston, had risen with great violence against the distributors of *incendiary pamphlets, negroes* and *houses of ill-fame;* but the *Standard,* in another part of the same article, speaking of the affair at Baltimore, says the attack was at first divided against the houses of two gentlemen connected with the *Bank of Maryland,* which had some time since failed: so that, here were the literary incendiaries, negroes, bad-houses, bawds and bankers, all extirpated with one blow of the spontaneous force of the people of Baltimore. This is called a "*disgraceful riot*" by the *Standard.* It appears, at all events to have been successful. It appears also, that at New York, there has been a tremendous fire, which has happened to destroy *upwards of ten newspaper establishments.* If this have been by mere accident it is certainly a remarkable co-incidence, that while the planters of the South and the merchants of Baltimore, were taking such energetic measures to stop the progress of the "incendiary newspapers and pamphlets;" that at this same moment, arson on a grand scale may have been resorted to in the North, and in the greatest city of the Union, to destroy the source of those publications. Let not Sir Robert Peel and the Editor of the *Standard,* talk as if the dissolution of the North American Union were at hand!

BERNE.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

September 1.

One letter—and that not a long one—suffices to give you an ample idea of the present state of Swiss politics; and of the change which has occurred in them since last year; and of the apparently insignificant labour of the Diet in the session just terminated. You are well aware—for we all remember here the interest and space which you devoted to our struggle at the time of the stand made by the Bernese authorities, as soon as they became the executive of the country, against the arrogant dictation of all the South German Courts. The Government at first determined to make no concession; but it soon perceived that this was impossible without effectual support from the Constitutional Governments of the West. And all the support the Swiss obtained was an advice to yield. The Bernese Vorort accordingly resolved to compromise the difference—not to yield the exact point so arrogantly demanded, but to make such concessions on others, as would satisfy the pride of the Courts and their representatives. In this they succeeded. The now Emperor of Austria proved pliant; and his Envoy attended the opening of the Diet.

Of this quarrel but one result followed—that of leaving on every Swiss mind the conviction, that Switzerland must suffice for herself; and that it is but an idle dream to expect support from the revolutionised government of France, or from that of England. This conviction guides the legislative conduct of the leaders of the Swiss Diet in the present year. The questions, which in former years absorbed all interests, were brought forward and discussed in this year with secondary interest. On the reform of the Federal Constitution, and the formation of a central power, for instance, opinions were so divergent, and the public feeling so little excited, that a sitting or two sufficed to get rid of it. The subject that occupied more than one-half of the whole time of the Diet, was a new military organisation for Switzerland. All were impressed with the necessity of augmenting and putting on a solid footing the national army; and the result has been that 60,000 disciplined soldiers can be mustered in a

very short time, in lieu of the 30,000 who could be previously called on. It is singular that the most pacific of countries should thus, in the most profound peace, have been pre-occupied exclusively with preparations for war, and evidently alarmed into taking precautions for defending its neutrality and independence with its own arm. The experience acquired in the late diplomatic quarrel of the sentiments and respective force of the several courts of Europe, left this impression on the minds of Swiss statesmen.

Notwithstanding the check put to the progress of the great question of reforming the federal system, the Swiss Liberals have every reason to be satisfied with the progress of ideas. Their exertions for the futherance of education have been followed by the best results; and the ultra spirit of the Conservative Cantons is gradually giving way before them, as well as before the influence of material interests. Thus Uri, long so retrograde, finds itself liberalised by the new and improved road which traverses it towards Italy, and which links it with the liberal Canton of Lucerne. Schweitz, another stronghold of petty aristocracy, has been forced into the same path by the separation from it of a large district, whose spirit of improvement it is obliged to emulate. The Canton of Unterwalden alone, shut up by the mountains so as to offer no thorough fare, remains as stubborn and as hostile to amelioration as your British House of Peers—of a seat in which the aboriginal shepherds of these hills are worthy. As an example I may tell you that there is now a steamboat on every Swiss lake except on that where it is most required by the interests both of travel and of commerce, viz. upon the lake of Lucerne, which forms the natural high road from Swabia to the Milanese. But the good folk of Unterwalden cannot abide the innovation of steam, which would ruin their boatmen, poison their fish, and inevitably revolutionise their Canton.

What must be much more interesting to you than all this is what I can assure you of, the determination of every Swiss, Deputy or no Deputy, never to admit an adhesion to the Prussian tariff system. The idea was not even entertained in the Committee appointed by the Diet to negotiate, or prepare the way for negotiating, with the German Commercial Union. Baden and Bavaria, they say, must relax. There will indeed be no legislative infringement of the Commercial Union, to which they have adhered. But at Berne they are already assured that some exemptions will be made in favour of Swiss products by ordonnance, though not by law. And that the relation between South Germany and Switzerland will not suffer the interruption that was feared.

I would trespass far beyond the limits of a letter, were I to expatiate on a great social change taking place here, viz. the spread of *pietism*, or of a rigid puritanic feeling in religion. The able and amiable person at the head of the Government (to whom, by-the-bye, the Ultra-Radicals here cannot forgive the crime of being noble), M. de Tavel, gives countenance to this Puritanism, which is little suiting to diplomatic taste or habits. But this subject might lead me to personalities.

P.S. The French Government have just forwarded a brisk remonstrance. A banker of Mulhausen purchased a property in the little canton of Liesthal or County Basle. The authorities perceived, too late, that such a gigantic proprietor would derange the entire balance of power in their little republic; besides, they detest bankers and fundholders as much as President Jackson himself, from their old feud with the capitalists of Basil; consequently they have refused M. Wahl, the banker, the rights of citizenship. M. de Broglie has taken up the cudgels for the banker, and writes wickedly—quite in the vein of a Minister of Press-law—against the little republic of Liesthal.

WAR.

THE following article, from the *Morning Herald*, of Sept. 8th, will engage the attention of every man who

is not either Jew or foreign holder of English funds. There may be difference of opinion as to the *cause*, but there can be but one sentiment as to the *effect!*

"It is painful to every Englishman who feels for the honour of his country to contemplate the humiliation of the national flag in the waters of the East. No British vessel of war is allowed to pass the Dardanelles, because Russia commands the Porte to close against us the gates of the Bosphorus. This is the practical result of the treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, more generally known by the designation of the "Secret Treaty," which Count Orloff negociated with the Turkish Government behind the back of the feeble and drowsy Lord Ponsonby. It is true, that when our Ambassador awoke from his state of diplomatic torpor, and saw what had been done by the active and wily Russian, he protested against the treaty, as did also the French Ambassador, who either was, or pretended to be, as ignorant of the Orloff intrigue while it might have been counteracted, as the representative of his Britannic Majesty. Well, the protests of both England and France are unheeded, and, at the first demand of Russia, the treaty has been put in force. To the honour of Lord Palmerston be it recorded that, for the first time has it happened under his Administration of Foreign Affairs, that a British vessel of war dare not disturb the supremacy of the Russian flag in the waters of the Bosphorus.

"It is now admitted by the Treasury Journals that the Earl of Durham, going on his mission of Ambassador to St. Petersburg *via* Constantinople, will not ask for a firman to allow the Barham frigate, in which he sails, to proceed through the straits of the Dardanelles to the port of Odessa, where he intends to disembark. The reason assigned is that "our Government does not consider it for the interest of this country that men-of-war belonging to other States should pass the Dardanelles, and it, *therefore*, asks no permission, which might serve as a pretext for other Governments to do the same." How very considerate. Now we assert, directly in the teeth of this *quasi*-official announcement, that it is as true as if it were said that the Sultan acting under the control of Russia would dare to give us the firman if we asked for it.

"It is known that the Porte, having been induced to grant a firman to the French sloop-of war La Mesange, did afterwards, upon the remonstrance, or rather the command, of the Russian Minister, revoke it. The *Journal des Débats* asserts this positively; but it is a fact, which our own correspondent, and also the correspondent of another morning paper, had previously narrated, and in a more circumstantial manner. Here is the account of the matter given by our own correspondent, under the date of Constantinople, August 11.

"'I see that the affair of the French schooner of war Mesange, which took place a couple of months back, excited public attention; and as it turned out to be quite the touchstone of the question, I will now detail exactly how it occurred, according to the version of one who cannot but be well informed on the subject. Admiral Roussin was desirous of sending Monsieur Tepier in the schooner to Trebisonde, and knowing that there might be obstacles on account of the treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, he first secured the good offices of the Reis Effendi, the Seraskier, and some other influential men. The Reis Effendi sent in a *telkhis* or official report to the Sultan, couched in favourable terms. The Sultan, with his own hand, wrote upon it *verilsun* (let it be given). The French Ambassador was informed of this, and waited in hourly expectation that the firman would be placed in his possession. In the meantime the English Ambassador, having heard that a French vessel of war would be allowed to go into the Black Sea, expressed a wish to obtain a similar permission for the Volage frigate. M. Boutinieff ascertained this, and lost not a moment in sending Hantcherli, his

first dragoman, to the Reis Effendi, to declare, in the strongest terms, that if the ships of war went into the Black Sea, Russia would at once consider the treaty in question as annulled. The Reis Effendi had, consequently, only to *back out* as best he could: he threw himself upon the generosity of Admiral Roussin, offering a firman for the Mesange, if he would go through the Bosphorus as a merchant vessel, and not in the character of a Government schooner, but refusing it otherwise. The Admiral replied—'No; I must have all or nothing,' and the latter (nothing) came to his share. The French Embassy gave it out, however, that the firman *had* been given, but, as *a point de delicatesse,* it had not been made use of. It was *not* granted, however, neither could the Turks permit the passage of the Volage. The Black Sea is a *mare clausum* to us, to the French, to all nations, Russia excepted.'

"We believe the account of our correspondent, because the accuracy of our intelligence from that quarter has never yet been disproved in any material fact. The instructions under which the Treasury Journals write do not allow them to disclose the whole truth, if they happen to know it. Their object is not to enlighten the public on this important subject, but to save Lord Palmerston from the discredit of having compromised the honour and interests of England by truckling to the insolent pretensions of Russia in a more abject manner than any British statesman ever did before. The attempt is too late—the whole course of our foreign policy since he came into office has tended to aggrandise either the rapacious Autocrat of Russia, or the no less heartless despot of France, at the expense of the best interests of England; but, of course, his policy is that of the cabinet to which he belongs, and policy less English in its spirit and character than that of the Whigs, since their accession to power in 1830, never disgraced the page of our history. This party, as if totally destitute of the sentiment of patriotism, have acted all along, whether in political or commercial matters, as if they took a pride in sacrificing the interests of England to those of the foreigner.

"But the Treasury Journals, aware of the danger of adverting to the stipulations of the treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, take us much further back, and gravely assert that "the construction of the treaty of 1809, as practically understood between the two countries, does not permit of our ships of war going up the Bosphorus." They then proceed to say, "It is our interest that the law should prevail universally with respect to foreign nations, and *therefore*," mark, "no firman has been, or will be, solicited for the Barham to ascend further than Constantinople." So then, the treaty of a quarter of a century old is that on which we act, in submitting to a total exclusion from the Dardanelles, as to our ships of war, while those of Russia pass and re-pass those straits at their pleasure. Ah! our statesmen, in 1809, did not so read the treaty of that year, nor was it ever *practically* understood in that sense, until the "secret treaty" completed the disgrace of British policy in the East. The treaty of 1809 either excluded the vessels of war of *all* nations—those of Russia not excepted—from the Dardanelles, or it did *not* exclude *ours*. But Whig Ministers allow the Russian flag to float in undisputed dominion over those Turkish waters from which the British flag is excluded, which we say is a flagrant violation of the treaty of 1809, though very consistent with the treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, against which, be it remembered, our ambassador *protested*. Upon this point we extract a passage from the Turkish correspondence of another morning paper.

"'It is impossible, they supposed, that England should not ascertain on what plea is the admittance into the Euxine granted to her pendant in 1829 refused in 1835. Can England, they added, submit to the conditions of a treaty against the very existence of which she has solemnly protested? The mean, the furtive manner in which it has since been ascertained the Minister of a nation, 'ruler of the waves', has directed a British man-of-war to smuggle Mr. Ellis

and suite to Trebisonde, the impudence with which his organs in the press have dared to assert to the public that the metamorphosis of the Pluto into a yacht was necessary to enable this vessel to pass without hinderance through the Straits of the Dardanelles, although they are aware that, during the last eight years, men-of-war of all nations, and among these upwards of 12 English ships of all sizes, have, without the slightest objection being made by the Porte, been allowed to come and remain in station at Constantinople, with their full battery on deck, are looked upon by the majority of Turks as indications that their former suppositions were erroneous, and that Lord Palmerston has already shrunk before a question which the consciousness of his incapacity prevents him from grappling with."

"It seems hardly credible, although the facts stare us in the face, that in the nineteenth century England, so lately acknowledged by all the world the supreme ruler of the ocean, should not dare to unfurl her flag in those eastern seas where the barbarian power of Muscovy stretches the growing pinions of maritime dominion.

"As to Lord Durham, he showed himself to be a poor and inefficient representative of the Majesty of England at the court of the Czar, on a former occasion, and we do not wonder that his new journey to St. Petersburg should be signalised by an act of humiliation to Russian ascendancy. Well do we recollect how his weak vanity was caught by the insidious smiles and the deceitful hospitality which the Autocrat bestowed upon him when at his court upon that former occasion. Well do we recollect also that the Ministerial Journals informed the public that the object of that mission had been completely successful; but what the real object of the mission was never officially transpired. The Treasury scribes told us, indeed, that by the success of the mission two great points were gained—the settlement of the Belgico-Dutch question, and the concession of favourable terms to Poland. Unfortunately, however, for these announcements, the Belgico-Dutch question has been more unsettled, and Poland has been more cruelly treated ever since Lord Durham's mission than before. If, then, he went to procure terms for Belgium and for Poland, his mission, which was conducted in the most pompous and expensive manner, was a miserable failure. Will he dare to mention the name of Poland now?"

The following is the paragraph of the *Morning Chronicle*, referred to in the above article.

"Advices have been received at the Foreign Office, that the firman for the passage of the Pluto steamer to Trebizond, with Mr. Ellis on board, had been granted at Constantinople without the slightest difficulty. When the Pluto shall have landed Mr. Ellis at Trebizond, it will return to Constantinople, and thence convey Lord Durham to Odessa. The construction of the treaty of 1809, as practically understood between the two Governments, does not permit of our ships of war going up the Bosphorus. It is our interest that that law should prevail universally with respect to foreign nations; and therefore no firman has been, nor will be, solicited for the Barham to ascend farther than Constantinople. If, therefore, a *Russian steamer* should be placed at his Lordship's disposal, the offer will be *respectfully declined.*"

SIR ROBERT PEEL'S SPEECH

AT TAMWORTH, AT A DINNER GIVEN TO HIM ON FRIDAY, SEPT. 4TH.

(*From the Standard.*)

SIR R. PEEL then rose, amidst most tremendous cheering, and spoke to the following effect:—Gentlemen, it would have been to me a most severe disappointment and mortification if any circumstances had occurred to prevent my fulfilling the engagement under which I

had placed myself to meet you to-day. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, circumstances over which I had no control might have called me away, and the public duties I had to fulfil might have prevented me from fulfilling my engagement with you, but I know that if those duties were of importance to the nation, you would have accepted them as an excuse, and permitted me to forego the satisfaction of meeting you here, in order that I might attend my public duties in parliament or elsewhere. I know your forbearance, and it would be a great personal sacrifice to me if my public duties interfered with my attendance here on this occasion. In the first place I have to acknowledge the undivided attention of this assembly, and to thank them for the enthusiastic manner they proposed that my health should be pledged. It is impossible for me to address you from this place, and in this room, without being reminded of the occasion and of the circumstances under which I addressed many of you here now not many months ago. Circumstances were different then to what they are now. On the last time that I addressed you I was in the situation of the First Minister of the Monarch of this country. (Cheers.) I then stood in the highest and most honourable situation that human ambition can attain or aspire to. (Cheers.) I was then honoured with the confidence of a beloved Sovereign—I then presided over the councils of one of the most celebrated and powerful nations on earth. I am now in a different situation. I am descended from the proud eminence upon which I was placed, and find myself now in the rank of my fellow-citizens. When last I appeared amongst you, I entered into the details of my election, and I told you that I had risen to the eminence alluded to by no base artifice or intrigue, and I now think I can say that I have descended from it with no discredit or dishonour to myself. (Cheers.) I accepted the appointment on the call of the Sovereign of this country, who, by his prerogative, has the right of choosing ministers to advise with, and who are responsible for that advice. I resigned office when I saw that I could not conduct the affairs of the country consistently with the acknowledged principles of the constitution. My colleagues and myself avowed that principles against the established practice of the constitution were not tenable, and we assented to the other principle, that opposition to a majority of the House of Commons would establish a dangerous precedent. I and my colleagues had no wish to have our names connected with the establishment of such a precedent—we, therefore, properly resolved on resigning the offices our Sovereign had been pleased to confer on us. When I last addressed you in this room I entertained the confident expectation, and though that expectation has been disappointed, I would still entertain it, and I believe that we have still prospects of success. (Loud and continued cheers.) My belief that we shall still be successful, and that we should have been so, is founded on the honour, integrity, and my experience in public life of the men with whom I had the honour of being in colleague. (Cheers.) However, the expectation of being enabled to carry measures which would be practically useful and satisfactory to the public, was founded on the belief that the opposition in the House of Commons was not found connected by any bond of public opinion—by any bond of similar principles—or by any bond of private attachment to each other (a laugh), which could put me on my guard, or make me conceive that they would afterwards unite in opposition to the government over which I presided. (Hear, hear.) I have since found that I gave them greater credit for sincerity than they deserved. (A laugh.) I now find that I have relied too much as to the truth of the language with which they have spoken of each other. (Hear, hear.) I really thought, from what I had seen, that they had ample means of knowing each other, and that, therefore, I was right in trusting to the accuracy of their information. (Cheers and laughter.) But it appears that I have been deceived, and I beg to refer you to a former speech from the throne, as to what was stated then by the government of his Majesty, which was composed of many of the individuals then in office, and who then advised his Ma-

jesty to make the following declaration: —"But I have seen with feelings of "deep regret and just indignation, the "continuance of attempts to excite the "people of Ireland to demand a repeal "of the legislative union"—"To the "practices which have been used to pro-"duce disaffection to the state, and mu-"tual distrust and animosity between "the people of the two countries, are "chiefly to be attributed the spirit of "insubordination which, though for the "present in a great degree controlled by "the power of the law, has been but too "perceptible in many places." (Cheers.) The party to whom this applied was not more complimentary than those who had thus described him. (Hear, hear.) One month before this party came into office, he addressed this letter to Lord Duncannon, "You belong to the Whigs, "and, after four years of the most ema-"ciating experience, we ought, indeed, "to have known that Ireland had nothing "to expect from the Whigs but in-"tolerant contempt and malignant and "treacherous hostility. In plain truth, "my Lord, it is quite manifest, that "Lord Melbourne is quite incompetent "to the high office he holds." (Loud cheers and laughter.) "It is lamentable "to me to think that the destinies of "the Irish people should, in any degree, "depend on so inefficient a person." Gentlemen, I confess that this statement is none of mine, but those opinions of those parties are now upon record, and are become matter of history. In January last, one of the parties was, as I have shown, not content with the others, yet now he is in close and affectionate union with them. (Cheers and laughter.) However, all I can say is, that they have sacrificed on the altar of their country their ancient hostilities, and the union has given to one party office, and to the other power. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, the third source of confidence I entertained when I entered office was that it was my intention to propose those measures which had been proposed to parliament by the former government, and thought that I should have the approbation of that government. I had not undertaken to govern on ultra principles. I was aware, and so must all of you, that great changes had taken place in the institutions of the country, and that it was expected that the course any government would pursue, would be to accommodate itself to those changes. I meant to do so (hear, hear), and I do say, that, whatever had been my opinions with respect to the Reform Bill, he must be a madman who should forget that it had passed. (Cheers.) If I were allowed to continue, I firmly believe that the measures I intended to propose would be calculated to satisfy the great majority of the reasonable portion of the community. I intended to propose measures of extensive reform. I did not intend to do this merely for the sake of conciliating popular opinion, but in order to adjust measures that had been left by former governments in such a state, that it was absolutely necessary that they should be finally settled. I stated in general terms what those measures would be, without entering into the details of them, for I was not permitted to do so; and I trusted that, when those details were laid before the country and maturely deliberated upon, they would not fall short of the expectations of the people. (Hear, hear.) I will now again repeat some of the measures it was my intention to propose for the sanction of parliament. In the first place, I should have proposed a safe and practical measure for the commutation of tithes in England; and I should have proposed that measure on equitable principles and on voluntary adjustment. But if voluntary adjustment failed me, it was not my intention to exclude a compulsory principle. (Hear, hear.) But when I say this, I beg that it may not be understood that it was not my intention that the fair equivalent should not be given for the property that was to be taken away. (Cheers.) There was another measure, which, on entering office, I found unsettled, and which I considered to be a fertile source of dissensions throughout the country, and, particularly, in large towns—I mean the payment of church rates by the Dissenters. I believe that the Church of England would gain—I believe that its institutions would be rendered more

stable, by the settlement of this question. Though I am in favour of the principle, that the church should depend on the public for its support, at the same time I am anxious for relieving Dissenters as much as possible from some of its demands. It is my wish, also, to adjust other questions, which were still unsettled, to the satisfaction of all, except of those—and I trust they are few in number—who wish to disturb the harmony that ought to prevail between the Dissenters and the members of the Church of England. I did wish in whatever I did to consult the members of the Church of England, which is always an object of paramount importance to me. (Loud cheers.) I intended to give such advantages with respect to marriage and baptism, as would relieve the Dissenters from conforming even in appearance with the forms prescribed by those from whose doctrines they seceded. I also intended, in conjunction with my colleagues, to proceed with the improvements that had been suggested by members of the government that preceded me, and which had been left unsettled, —I mean those improvements which regard our ecclesiastical laws. With respect to economy, I intended to insist upon it as far as would not be dangerous, and as far as would not be likely to disturb the tranquillity of the country. (Cheers.) I intended to make every reduction in the expenditure of the country that was consistent with public faith and public safety. (Hear, hear.) The estimates of the government over which I had the honour to preside was lower by 400,000*l.* than any estimate produced since the time of the war. For this reduction, the credit, I avow it, does not belong exclusively to the government at the head of which I was. Those estimates were in part prepared by my predecessors, and I am the last man in the world to detract from their merits, or from what they have done with respect to economy. Gentlemen, I think those measures, if I had been allowed an opportunity of proposing them in detail, and the House of Commons had maturely deliberated upon them in a fair spirit, I think I may say they would have been brought to a successful issue, and that the labours of that session would have satisfied those who were loudest in their complaints and in their cries for a redress of grievances. I do not pretend to say, however, that the measures passed in such a session would have given universal satisfaction; but I know that there are persons fonder of grievances, for the sake of the grievances themselves, than of having them redressed, and that such persons do not wish to be deprived of having them to complain of. (Cheers.) There were two other questions which I meant in proper time to legislate upon—the first is that which relates to the municipal corporations of England and Wales, and the second that which regards the settlement of the tithe question in Ireland, and the removal of the abuses that exist in that Establishment. (Cheers.) I certainly did refuse, when called upon in the House of Commons, to give any promise as to the measures which I intended to propose with respect to the reform of the municipal corporations. I was justified in refusing this promise, or of giving any detailed explanation on the subject, on the ground that I had not as yet read the evidence nor seen the report of the commissioners. I thought it best, before I gave a promise, to wait for that information which I considered necessary to enable me so to legislate as to finally settle the question. (Hear, hear.) After I had seen and perused the evidence and the report of the corporation commissioners, I immediately admitted the necessity of corporation reform; but when I say this, it is not to be understood that I lent myself to measures which were not founded in justice, and which would carry changes into the institutions of the country to a great length. (Hear.) Gentlemen, on this point, and in making this confession, permit me to tell you that I sacrificed, and to no small extent, my own private feelings, for, when I made the admission that corporation reform was necessary, I did consent to interfere with the established rights of a corporation (hear, hear), which never in any one instance abused its powers, but whose conduct was always founded in justice, in honour, and in

integrity; and whose every act was distinguished by the most irreproachable propriety. (Loud cheers.) I will now state the immediate course I intended to pursue with respect to the settlement of the other question—I allude to that of the Irish Church. I proposed to reform the abuses that had crept in in consequence of time, in consequence of the conduct of private individuals, and of other circumstances, but was determined to resist, and did resist to the utmost of my power, the principle of the appropriation of the revenues of the Irish Church than strictly to ecclesiastical purposes. (Cheers.) I resisted that appropriation, first, because it contained a principle that was fraught with danger, and, secondly, because I knew from accurate calculations, that, if there was a new distribution of the revenues of the Irish Church, it would be found that they were not more than sufficient for the decorous maintenance of the clergy belonging to that church. (Hear, hear.) This question was the immediate ground upon which the existence of the late administration terminated. I have perceived that, upon recent occasions, and by high authority, the measures I projected have been denominated (the term is very expressive) "clap-trap." If they were "clap-trap" measures, they were the recent ones of my predecessors. (Laughter and cheers.) Every one of their measures was undertaken, and then left in such a state, that it was necessary for their successors to attempt a practical adjustment of every one of them. (Loud and continued cheering.) I really think that those who introduced those measures, and left them unsettled, were more liable to the charge of "clap-trap" than those who in good earnest set about attempting to settle them. I believe that those measures, if they had been undertaken by the government to which I belonged, might have been settled, if I had only the good fortune to have possessed so much of the confidence of the House of Commons as to induce them to enter into practical deliberation of those measures; and when I was telling you that I had in the House a majority of the members of England, I do not think that any attempt to govern was so rash as some people have considered, nor that my hopes to settle those questions were so remote as many people thought. (Cheers.) Far be it from me to place the members of any portion of these realms beneath the other. Far be it from me to rank the representatives of Ireland in the scale lower than those of England. (Hear, hear.) But still I will say that I had the good fortune of having on my side a majority of the representatives of the English people. (Cheers.) I had, therefore, reason to hope that I should have been able to have settled all these questions according—mind,—according to the principles of our ancient constitution. (Loud cheers.) What I mean by this, is, that I should have carried them with the cordial good-will of the three branches of the legislature—(Hear, hear.) I for one think that no measure can be satisfactory to the people in which the consent of the House of Lords has been extorted by menace of violence (tremendous cheering); and I believe that the people of this country would find measures passed with the sanction of the three branches of the legislature more in harmony with our constitution, and our institutions, than if they had been passed by one branch of the legislature, whilst the consent of the other was excluded. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, you are probably aware that of late great hostility has been shown to the House of Lords (hear, hear), that notice has been given by an hon. member, that he would, at an early period of next session, move for leave to bring in a bill to reform the House of Lords. (Hear, hear.) By reforming the House of Lords I understand nothing more than that they should be deprived of having a voice, and by it is meant the establishment of a popular assembly, free from all control. (Cheers.) It is my opinion that such an assembly, investing itself with absolute power of legislation, would soon attack the prerogatives of the crown, and destroy the constitution. (Hear.) I do not hesitate to say that such a usurpation on the part of one branch of the legislature would end in the most intolerable

tyranny. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, I am, and I hope you are, for the maintenance of the British constitution. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, I hope that you will not pass such a libel on the Reform Bill, as to declare it inconsistent with the maintenance of the British constitution. I for one cannot do so, and I will strive to the utmost in my power to prevent the tyranny that would arise from that assembly which should be elected solely by the public voice. (Cheers.) The history of all countries, at least the history of every country in Europe, that have tried the experiment—that have adopted the establishment of such an assembly, proved that it was not compatible with the liberty or happiness of any of those countries. Why the very history of our own country, as well as the history of France and other countries, showed what were the results of being governed solely by an assembly elected by the public voice. (Hear, hear.) Such an assembly generally ends in the assumption of supreme power by some successful military commander, to whom the people revert, thinking it better to submit to one tyrant, rather than bow to the many-headed one to which they had been before subject in the shape of one popular assembly. If they should risk trying such an experiment, they would find that the results would always be the same; that they did not arise from anything like mere accidental circumstances, but proceeded from causes inherent in human nature. (Hear, hear.) When I consider the feelings of the people of this country—when I consider the way property is distributed—when I consider the rights of that property—when I consider the ancient laws by which every thing connected with this country is bound together, it is my belief, that if one assembly should legislate singly, call it the House of Commons, or by any other name you please, the same results would follow which I have already pointed out. In such an assembly you would have the civil power usurped by some military commander, and you would be glad, like the people of France, after pouring out a deluge of blood, to revert to the ancient order of things, and to establish monarchy once more. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, knowing your good sense, it is scarcely necessary for me to warn you, and to tell you, that a popular assembly would not be a meeting consisting of philosophers and sages (laughter), entirely intent on the promoting of the public good, and completely forgetful of their own interest—(cheers and laughter)—whose sole object would be to benefit the public and to promote the public order. Do not believe that such would be the case, but rather believe that amongst the majority of such an assembly you would find a nucleus of designing and cunning men, who, whilst prating about public liberty and order, would be, in the mean time, doing every thing to obtain the furtherance of their own ends. As I said before, our own country and France have shown that such would be the result of those principles. Those results, I repeat, are not accidental—they are as certain as that cause produces effect, as immutable as the laws by which the world is governed, which are as certain, as all that happens by the operation of those laws within our sphere, as that comet now appearing within our own system after the lapse of an interval of half a century. (Immense cheering.) Well—if hostility prevails against the House of Lords, I am glad that those who profess it have given indications of it, and of the plans they mean to pursue. For it will put the people of England upon their guard, or if they feel such inconvenience, it will show that they wish to change the present system of government for one of a more democratic form. It might be said that I am cautiously avoiding to make any reference to America, but that I confined myself solely to the countries of Europe. It might be said, and I know it will be contended, that the democratic principle has been successful in America. It will be said that under this government the people enjoy civil and other rights almost to equality, and yet that that country is able to defend itself from, and even to punish, aggression from abroad. I shall be told if I look to

the States of America, I shall find an adoption of the popular principle has been successful there. Very well. I look to the States of South America, where the popular principle has been incorporated, and can I acknowledge that it has been successful in these states, when almost every newspaper that reaches me, talks of insurrection among them? (Hear, hear.) What has prevented the establishment of a regular government in those states if the form of the popular one was so very good? (Hear, hear.) If the principle is correct by which we are told that we can govern ourselves, and that there is no advantage to be derived from our ancient institutions, and from obedience to authority, how happens it that revolutions in the states I have just mentioned do not form exceptions, but rather a general rule? The real revolution that will happen in South America will be that by which a regular and permanent government will be established in that country (Hear, hear.) I have admitted that the popular form of government has been successful in the North American States, but I deny the general position that, because it has succeeded there, it will suit this country. North America is a wide and most extensive country. It contains a vast tract of land unoccupied, to which the discontented and disaffected can be sent; and its position alone makes it widely different from England. The republican institutions that will suit a new country may not on that account suit a country which contains men educated as we are —subject to such laws as we are—and holding property by such rights as we do, and having prejudices (you may call them prejudices if you will) that connect us with the ancient monarchy of England. (Loud cheers.) Let it not be understood that from what I have said I bear any ill-will towards the Americans. No. On the contrary, I wish them all possible success to themselves as well as to their government. Let them believe me when I say that I would rather see them happy under their republican institutions than see any form of government, even monarchy, to which I am so attached, confirm the unhappiness of the people. Though we received accounts of the happiness of the people of the United States, I do not see that is any reason why this country should adopt a republican form of government. (Hear, hear.) But I happened to read in a paper which I shall quote—and I quote it as an authority. I allude to an article which I read in it on the 25th of Aug. 1835. Mind, the paper I am quoting from is not a Conservative journal, but one that strenuously espouses the cause of the present government—I quote the extract, not that I have a wish to show the unhappiness of the people of the United States, but when I was told of the happiness of the people of that country, I was rather startled at the article in question, and it gave me much reason to doubt of the vaunted happiness of the inhabitants of the United States, when I find the following article inserted in a journal that professes to be the organ of the present government. "The news contained in the New York papers which have been brought over by the Philadelphia, are full of melancholy interest. An insurrection amongst the slaves of Havanna, the spread of the summary mode of punishment called 'Lynch law,' (by the by, by Lynch law is meant hanging a person without trial)—(a laugh), and the hanging of five gamblers at Vicksburg without trial—acts of aggression on the part of the authorities of Michiganupon the inhabitants of Toledo, Ohio, and the seizure at Livingstone, Mississipi, of two abolition preachers, and of some negroes, who appear to have been hanged in the street by the exasperated inhabitants with a small form of trial, scarcely constitute a bare catalogue of the enormities which these papers contain!" Gentlemen, this is the testimony of the English paper I alluded to, and the following is the testimony of the *New York Evening Post*:—"The account which we publish in another column from an extract of the *Toledo* (Ohio) *Gazette*. will be perused by our readers with regret. With civil feuds in the north, tumultuous proceedings of anarchical and fatal character in the

west, and a servile war in the south, to say nothing of the factious and incendiary spirit which has lately broken out in various parts of our Atlantic border, the country does in truth exhibit at present a spectacle to the European nations, which we fear will be commented upon in a way not calculated to recommend the example of a popular government." Now, gentlemen, if you will only bear in mind what has been the issue of similar experiments, you will not very much indulge with a popular government. Even the expectations which it was hoped in a cause from the "three glorious days of July," were somewhat abated in this country, and the acts of the present government were the theme of every conversation. For my part I do not complain of the French King, who I believe is desirous of promoting the welfare of his people. It is not his fault that he is obliged to have recourse to the present proceedings agitating the Chambers. It is the fault of those few who are teaching the people to employ resistance, that the French legislature is obliged to adopt severe laws. It is not the fault of the government that the people of that country are made to submit to a greater tyranny than that to which they were subject under the ancient laws of the country. I think I may say that the French now enjoy less liberty than we enjoy in this country under our ancient laws, and the mixed and balanced government under which we live. Now, after the threats that I have heard uttered against the House of Lords, and against the bishops, and about depriving the members of that house of their right of veto, I think it is time for the people of this country to make up their minds, and to say whether they are friendly to the redress of their just grievances, or whether they are dissatisfied with the institutions of their country, and are ready to suffer an organic change in it, for the purpose of substituting an uncontrolled popular assembly. (Cheers.) I am not one to advise upon a pertinacious adherence in any branch of the legislature to its own principles. (Hear, hear.) I saw lately advised a compromise, but it is a compromise worthy of the dignity of each branch of the legislature. It is my wish to avoid collision between the two houses of parliament, and I believe that the welfare of this country consists in that the people of it should be able to apply themselves to the honest pursuit of industry, without being constantly harassed by dissensions of the legislature. But I assert that whilst I advise a virtuous and dignified compromise I will never consent to any species of compromise that will tend to destroy any one branch of the legislature. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I feel that I have detained you too long. (Cries of No, no; go on.) In conclusion, I will say that it is my earnest hope that you and the people of this country—that all those to whom any franchise has given power, will compare their country with any that now exists, or that has been recorded in history. I also hope that you will take into consideration the great changes that, within the last few years, have taken place in the state—that certain civil qualifications have been taken away—that a reform has taken place in the House of Commons, and that all this has been done with the consent of the House of Lords. (Hear, hear.) I trust that the people of England will compare their condition with that of the most favoured people of the globe; though they have not all the advantages which they might have, still they have considerable ones, in enjoying to such an extent as they do the liberty of action and the freedom of speech—in not being trammelled in their industry and expansion of wealth, and in having the free intercourse they have with all parts of the country. Look to those advantages, and then reflect on the consequences of the interruption of the industry for even a single week in this country! I ask you whether the republican institutions can now, or are likely to find favour in this country? I ask you whether the popular voice, represented through popular channels alone, is sufficient for you? Don't you think yourselves fairly represented, and that you are in a state of obtaining a fair redress of your grievances? I trust that you will not be insane enough to coun-

tenance, in the slightest degree, the wild and baneful projects of a few. I trust, I hope, indeed I am almost sure that the people of this enlightened land will not deprive themselves of the advantages they now enjoy—that they will discharge their duty towards their posterity by handing down to them those rights which we all have in the constitution, and which as we ourselves have inherited them we ought to transmit intact to be inherited by our children and our children's children. The right hon. bart. resumed his seat amidst loud and general cheering.

REMARKS

ON SIR ROBERT PEEL'S SPEECH.

The following are two sets of remarks which I find in the *Morning Chronicle* of Monday, on this speech. It must be confessed, that however much they vary in some points from the truth, what there is of truth in them is well offered and still better merited.

No. 1.

The second Manifesto of the crafty Leader of *soi-disant* Conservative Party will be found in another part of our paper. It must be confessed that Sir Robert Peel treats his Tory friends in the Upper House somewhat like children. With one kick he upsets the house of cards, which they were so long engaged in constructing; but in return he puts himself forward as the champion who is to lick all the other big boys that may presume to meddle with them. He comes up to London and countenances the rapid demolition of the chief enactments of hereditary Legislators. He goes down to the country and holds forth on the impropriety of interfering with the rights of hereditary Legislation. The Commons are propitiated by recollections of the readiness with which he quitted office in deference to majorities of that House. The Peers are soothed and flattered with expressions of unbounded regard, and determinations to resist the tyranny of "an assembly elected solely by the public voice." All is apparent candour—all is real dissimulation. A very disingenuous advantage is taken of a paragraph which appeared in a recent number of this Journal, giving a somewhat exaggerated account of disturbances and arbitrary proceedings in Havannah, and in some of the new acquisitions and slave districts of the United States. This untoward piece of intelligence is seized upon with eagerness, and held up as a bugbear to the good people of Tamworth and the country at large. The *anomalies arising from slavery*, and other peculiar circumstances, are insidiously put forth as the consequences of popular government. Insurrections, and summary modes of suppressing them, in distr icts where the bulk of the population are either in a rude and uncivilized state or are disqualified from any share in the making of laws, and treated and sold and transferred like other living cattle, are noticed in a way to lead people to suppose they were connected with liberal institutions, and *democracy* is charged by implication with the consequence of imperfect civilization, and with the evils that flow from keeping up that "*most stupid of all species of* ARISTOCRACY, *the aristocracy of the skin.*" But the whole of this wily speech is, what Lord Melbourne justly described the measures of our Tory conformer to be, a mere series of clap-traps. They are the efforts of a very cunning and experienced, but narrow and prejudiced mind, to reconcile a total want of broad and liberal principles with professions of liberal intentions, and to show off a paltry patchwork sort of policy, as a vastly clever and ingenious contrivance, the object of which really seems now to be to deceive all parties, in order more effectually to exalt "number one."

But if the Tories in London are offended with the semi-liberalism of the Tamworth Baronet, the Liberals must see what his real sentiments are, from his laudatory and ultra-conservative comments on Louis Philippe, and his present skilful "conservative" policy. If the laws against the Press are so good in France, why not introduce them into

England, Sir Robert? We are not aware that the English Press speaks its mind less fearlessly than that of our gallant neighbours on the other side of the Channel. We apprehend that an independent press is found to be equally inconvenient to hypocrites and "claptrap" politicians here as there. But how happens it, Sir Robert, that whilst you approve of these *benevolent contrivances* of your new protegé, not long since the constant mark for Tory sarcasm, "*for promoting the welfare of his people,*" all the organs of your party—Bigots and Conformers—Moderates and Ultras—are unanimous in denouncing them with the Liberal Press as the acts of a crafty despot, who, by means of slavish majorities in Chambers from which popular influence is excluded, is now engaged in abrogating the Charter, and trampling on the rights he had sworn to maintain—rights, to defend which the blood of Frenchmen has flowed in torrents—rights, to secure which a dynasty was changed, and a monarchy subverted. But thus it is ever with Sir Robert Peel! He has no sympathies for the wrongs of insulted millions; but when deceit and oppression go hand in hand with power and success—oh, then, his sympathies are awakened! There he finds a theme for befitting eulogy, and a hero for perfect approval!

Sir Robert Peel's argument about the independence of the present House of Lords rests upon the same delusive basis as the rest of his harangue. No one that we have heard ever denies the expediency or necessity of having a second branch of the Legislature, which ought, of course, to be independent of the other House; but the grand objection to the present House of Lords is, that it is essentially and practically a Tory House of Lords—a Chamber of Peers, the majority of whom have been created under Tory Governments, and for Tory purposes; and consequently placed, from every tie of prejudice and of party, as an obstacle to a straightforward reforming policy, and a bar in the way of improvement. If this irresponsible body is to govern the country according to its own discretion, well and good; but then the Reform Bill may as well be repealed, and the Peers should be openly allowed to nominate the Members of the other Chamber. This would be an intelligible proceeding. The Peers would be acknowledged as masters, and the Legislature would again act in harmony; but if this be not done, then, if legislation is to go on at all, a reform in the Upper House must take place, to make it work in unison with the Reformed House of Commons; and if the country is to have an effective system of liberal government, there is no man so unfit to be the instrument of conducting it, as this much-lauded and jesuitical Tory, the plausible and crafty Sir Robert Peel.

No. 2.

The favourite taunt of the Tories is the importance of Mr. O'Connell to the Government; but it would appear, from the speech of Sir Robert Peel at Tamworth, that he was not a whit of less importance to the late Ministry—nay, that it was founded upon his supposed alienation from the Whigs, and that this error in calculation of forces was the cause of failure. Thus it is manifest, that if on the one hand the support of Mr. O'Connell is essential to a Liberal Government, on the other his quarrel with the Whigs is as necessary to the existence of a Tory Ministry. The Tories think they sum up a vast deal of reproach in saying to the Government, "You cannot do without him;" but their own chief says in effect that they could not do without him, in another way—that they could not do without a quarrel between him and the Whigs. Where was the reliance of Sir Robert Peel when he formed his Ministry? Not upon the strength of the Tory party, but upon the disunion of the Liberals. He relied mainly upon the appearance of division in the popular camp, and in the attempt to govern he built all his hopes upon Mr. O'Connell—that is to say, he built all his hopes upon Mr. O'Connell's dissension with the Whigs. Who, then, can pretend to say that Mr. O'Connell was not all-important to that short-lived Go-

vernment? To use their favourite phrase, the breath of its nostrils was dissension between Mr. O'Connell and the members of the preceding Ministry, and wanting that breath it perished! We quote the words of Sir Robert Peel—

"The expectation of being enabled to carry measures which would be practically useful and satisfactory to the public was founded on the belief that the Opposition in the House of Commons was not connected by any bond of public opinion—by any bond of similar principles, or by any bond of private attachment to each other (a laugh), which could put me on my guard, or make me conceive that they would afterwards unite in opposition to the Government over which I presided (hear, hear). I have since found that I gave them greater credit for sincerity than they deserved (a laugh). I now find that *I have relied too much upon the language with which they have spoken of each other* (hear, hear). I really thought, from what I had seen, that they had ample means of knowing each other, and that therefore I was right in trusting to the accuracy of their information (cheers, and laughter). But it appears that I have been deceived, and I beg to refer you to a former Speech from the throne."

He then proceeded to quote the speech in which Mr. O'Connell was alluded to, which leaves no doubt that the disunion built upon was that supposed between Mr. O'Connell and the members of the Liberal Ministry. Sir Robert Peel now puts his finger in his eye, and whimpers out that he was sadly deceived in relying on angry words. He would have founded his Government on the pique of his opponents towards each other, but the pique vanished when the public cause required unanimity, and with it down went the ill-balanced Ministry. Had O'Connell fulfilled Peel's expectations—had he and his friends refused to act in harmony with the Whigs—the Peel Government might have existed upon that disunion; and Sir Robert evidently takes it very ill of the Radicals, English and Irish, that they did not carry on their little differences for the benefit of his party. "I counted upon your quarrels," says he in effect, "and you have miserably disappointed me." Rubbing his knuckles into his eyes, he blubbers out, almost hysterically, "I believed the Opposition was not connected by any bond of opinion" (here a burst of grief) "or by any private attachment" (another sob) "which could make me conceive they would afterwards unite in opposition to the Government I formed" (here a paroxysm of woe).

If Sir Robert had had a notion that Mr. O'Connell would not oblige him by carrying on war against the Whigs, he would have continued his travels in Italy. He came home full of reliance on Mr. O'Connell—full of reliance on the ill-will which he supposed to exist between him and the heads of the dissolved Administration, and O'Connell having disappointed his expectations, he failed in his foolish experiment. So it appears that Mr. O'Connell enters as largely into Tory plans of government, as he is alleged to do in those of Whigs.

Sir Robert Peel says that though defeated (because Mr. O'Connell did not help him by disagreement in the party of the People), he has still prospects of success. These are the pleasures of hope. But should not the egregious blunder he confesses warn him of the fallibility of his calculations? Is he still resting his hopes on Mr. O'Connell? Does he still build his fortunes on the back of the Member for Dublin? Does he still fondly fancy that Mr. O'Connell will lift him into office by a division among the Liberals? How these Tories do reckon on Mr. O'Connell, connecting their fortunes with the follies which they flatter themselves he may commit! If he would only play the fool, the Tories would govern by virtue of the error. We have Sir Robert Peel's admission that the union of Reformers disappointed all the calculations upon which he undertook office; and of course, while that union exists, the establishment of a Tory Ministry must, by his own showing, be impossible. He can therefore have nothing to hope, except from discord.

LONDON GAZETTE.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 4.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

Coupees, Francis and William, Luton, Bedfordshire, straw hat-manufacturers.

Macknight, James, Dawley, Salop, draper.

BANKRUPTS.

Heather, George, St. Ann's-place, Limehouse, and Argles, Edward, Brunswick-terrace, Commercial-road-east, mahogany-merchants.

Pulvertoft, Thomas, Wisbeach, Cambridgeshire, gentleman.

Raven, John, Suffolk-lane, Cannon-street, wholesale grocer.

Hindell, William, Brayton, Yorkshire, victualler.

Smith, John Ashwin, Bilston, Staffordshire, grocer.

Turberville, Thomas, Worcester, grocer and hop-merchant.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8.

BANKRUPTS.

Henderson, John, Great Surrey-street, Blackfriars, and Trinidad, master-mariner and merchant.

Brown, John, late of Southampton, jeweller and watch-maker.

Molyneux, Thomas, Falmouth, linen-draper.

Webster, John, and Webster, Jonathan Abraham, Wadsley, Yorkshire, paper-manufacturers.

LONDON MARKETS.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 4.

CORN EXCHANGE.

The wheat trade is full as dear as on last market day, but very little business is doing. Barley remains nominal at the prices of Wednesday, and the oat trade, for the few parcels disposed of, remains unaltered in price from our former quotations. Beans, peas, and other articles of grain, support Wednesday's prices, but are little in demand.

The arrivals are 2520 sacks of flour, 7750 qrs. of wheat, 400 of barley, 1590 of malt, 710 of oats, 3890 of Irish oats, and 2210 of foreign oats.

SMITHFIELD.

The finest young Scots this morning fetch 3s 8d to 4s per stone, and the best Lincolns and Durhams are 3s 2d to 3s 8d, with a flat market, the annual Saturnalia interfering with the regular business of the day. Coarse and inferior meat sells at 2s 4d to 3s. Mutton for prime Downs is 4s to 4s 2d, and the best Kentish and Leicester wethers offered are at 3s 6d to 3s 10d. Coarse inferior and second-rate ewes and sheep are 2s 6d to 3s. In veal the finest calves are worth 4s to 4s 8d, and dairy-fed porkers are 3s 6d to 4s.

Head of Cattle at Market.

Beasts, 474—Sheep and Lambs, 11,705—Calves, 267—Pigs, 332.

Price per stone, sinking offal.

	s.	d.	s.	d.		s.	d.	s.	d.
Beef -	2	4	to 4	0	Veal -	3	6	to 4	8
Mutton	2	6	to 4	2	Pork -	2	8	to 4	0
Lamb -	3	2	to 5	2	Irish -	2	6	to 3	6

Prices of Hay and Straw, per Load.

Hay -	3l	5s	0d	to	5l	5s	0d
Clover -	3l	15s	0d	to	5l	15s	0d
Straw -	1l	18s	0d	to	2l	5s	0d

HOPS.

BOROUGH, SEPT. 3.

The hop market begins now to be pretty well supplied daily with new hops, about five or six hundred pockets of which have arrived, some of very ordinary quality, and some pretty good. The prices of those sold have fetched from 50s to 90s per cwt., but there is not much demand for them yet, as better quality than those that have lately arrived may soon be expected. The old duty is backed at 225,000l., and there is but little doing in yearling or old hops at present.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 7.

CORN EXCHANGE.

There is a good supply of wheat at market this morning, but the business doing is on a very limited scale, and to effect sales a reduction must be submitted to. The parcels disposed of as yet, are confined to a few of fine quality. Nothing whatever is doing in the trade for barley, and the quotation is nominally as on last market day. The oat trade is very inanimate, but the price is nominally given as on last market day. In beans, peas, and other articles of grain, there is nothing to notice, and the general appearance of the market is exceedingly inanimate.

	s.	s.
Wheat, Kent and Essex -	30	a 44
Suffolk (White) - -	28	a 43
——— Norfolk - -	28	a 39
Barley - - - -	24	a 30
Malting - - - -	31	a 40
Malt - - - - -	00	a 00
Old, ditto - - - -	00	a 00
Peas, White - - -	28	a 31
——— Boilers - - -	30	a 32
——— Grey - - - -	27	a 30
——— Maple - - -	00	a 00
——— Wh. - - -	00	a 00
——— do. ord. -	00	a 00
——— Seed, last per	£00	a 00
Rye - - - - -	30	a 32
Beans, Small - - -	36	a 38
——— Old - -	00	a 00
——— Old Tick - -	34	a 36
Oats, Feed - - -	20	a 23
——— Old - - -	00	a 00
——— Poland - - -	24	a 24
——— New ditto - - -	00	a 00
——— Old - - - -	00	a 00
——— Potato - -	22	a 25
——— Scotch - -	00	a 00
Flour, per sack - -	28	a 30
Do. Fine - - - -	33	a 36

SMITHFIELD.

The finest young Scots this morning sell at 4s to 4s 2d per stone, and the best Kentish and Leicester wethers at 4s 2d to 4s 6d. Prime Durhams and Lincolns are quoted at 3s 8d to 4s, and the best Downs are 4s 4d to 4s 6d. Coarse and second-rate oxen sell at 2s 4d to 3s 2d, and inferior, coarse, and second-rate sheep and ewes at 2s 10d to 3s 8d. Pork, for dairy-fed porkers, is 4s to 4s 4d; large hogs are 2s 6d to 3s 4d. Prime young calves are 4s to 4s 8d, coarser and larger 3s 4d to 4s.

Head of Cattle at Market.

Beasts, 2310—Sheep and Lambs, 21,284—Calves, 256—Pigs, 392.

Price per stone, sinking offal.

	s. d.	s. d.		s. d.	s. d.
Beef -	2 4	to 4 2	Veal -	3 2	to 4 8
Mutton -	2 6	to 4 6	Pork -	2 6	to 4 4
Lamb -	3 6	to 5 4			

Hay and Straw Market, Per Load.

Hay -	3l	5s	0d	to 5l	5s	0d
Clover -	3l	15s	0d	to 5l	15s	0d
Straw -	1l	16s	0d	to 2l	0s	0d

NEWGATE AND LEADENHALL.

Monday, Sept. 7.

By the Carcase, per stone of 8 lbs.

NEWGATE.

Inferior Beef -	1s	10d	a 2s	2d
Middling ditto -	2s	2d	a 2s	6d
Prime large ditto	2s	6d	a 2s	10d
Ditto to small ditto	3s	0d	a 3s	2d
Large Pork -	2s	6d	a 2s	10d

LEADENHALL.

Prime Mutton -	3s	2d	a 3s	8d
Middling ditto -	2s	6d	a 3s	0d
Inferior ditto -	2s	2d	a 2s	4d
Veal - - -	2s	10d	a 4s	4d
Small Pork - -	3s	8d	a 4s	4d
Lamb - - -	3s	4d	a 4s	6d

HOP MARKET.

Price of Hops, per Cwt.

	E. Kent.	Mid. do.	Sussex.	Essex.	Farnham.
Bags:	s. s.	s. s.	s. s.	s. s.	s. s.
1834	56 a 84	56 a 80	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
1833	45 a 63	40 a 60	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
1832	35 a 50	35 a 56	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
1831	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
Pokts:					
1835	0 a 0	60 a 100	45 a 90	60 a 100	100 a 120
1834	60 a 90	56 a 80	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
1833	45 a 70	40 a 70	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0
1832	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0	0 a 0

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY D 24 JA 1936 CAMBRIDGE

PRICE OF FUNDS.

	Friday.	Saturday.	Monday.	Tuesday.	Wednesday.	Thursday.
Bank Stock - - -						
3 per Cent. Red. - -						
3 per Cent. Cons. -	90¾ ¼ ½ ¼ ⅜		90½	90⅝ ⅜	90⅜ ½ ⅜	90½ ⅜ ⅞ ⅛
3½ per Cent. Red. -						
New 3½ per Cent. -	99⅛ ¼	99⅛ ¼ 9	99⅛ ¼	99¼ ⅜ 87⅛	98⅞ 9	99 87⅞ 91⅛
Long Annuities - -	16¼ 9-16	16⅜ 9-16	–	16 11-16	16 11-16⅝	16 11-16
India Stock - - -			254½ 5½			
India Bonds - - -	4 6	4 6 par 3 pm	3 5	5	5	4 6
Exchequer Bills - -	19 21	20 15 18	17 19	17 19	19 17	17 19
Consols for Acct. -	90⅝ ½ ⅝	90⅛ ⅛ ⅜ ½	90⅜	90⅜ ¼	90¾ ⅛ ½ ⅝	90¾ ⅝ ¾
Brasilian - - - -	87½	87¼	86¼ 7		86¾	
Mexican 6 per Ct. -		35 36	35 6		35½	
Portuguese Reg. - -	87½ 7	87 6¾	87¼	86¼ ½	85½ 6	86¼ ¾
——— 3 per Ct. -						
Spanish - - - -	42½ 1¼ 2½	41⅝ ¾ 1	40¾ 1¼	39⅛	37½ 8	38 7⅞ 8⅛
Russian - - - -	107½	107½	107½	107⅞	107¼	107¼ 6¾
Dutch - - - - -	102⅜	102⅛	102⅛ ½	102⅜	102¼	102⅛
Belgian - - - -	100¼	101½	101½			101½
French 5 per Cent. -						
Columb. 3 per Cent.	31½ ¾	31¼	31½	31½	30½	30½ 1

Published at No. 167, Fleet Street, and printed at Lombard Street, Whitefriars, London, by William Cobbett.